UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

For Every Child Under the American Flag - - - - - - - *Miriam Ziony*

Let Britain Answer! - *Rattan S. Sekhon*

My Pacifism Stands - *John Nevin Sayre*

Water from the Rock - *Tracy D. Mygatt*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 10

Chicago, January 15, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 151
Jottings—J. H. H. 153
What Is Pacifism?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES. 154

ARTICLES—

For Every Child Under the American Flag—MIRIAM ZIONY. 155
Let Britain Answer!—RATTAN S. SEKHON 158
My Pacifism Stands—JOHN NEVIN SAYRE 160
Water from the Rock—TRACY D. MYGATT 160
On the Pacifist Front—VII 162

POETRY—

Early Armament Race—ELIOT WHITE 161

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Record of a Great Epoch—JULIA N. BUDLONG 163

CORRESPONDENCE—

Clear Thinking on War—HENRY W. PINKHAM 164

THE FIELD—

Liquor Control Six Years After Repeal—*New Jersey Committee for the Study of Liquor Control Methods* 150

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Liquor Control Six Years After Repeal

December 6th, 1939, marks the sixth anniversary of repeal of the 18th Amendment of the Federal Constitution. With abandonment of national prohibition, each of the several American states enacted regulatory liquor laws believed to be suited to its needs, and expressive of the desires of its citizens.

Eventually all of the states have rescinded or amended their own prohibitory laws, so that alcohol in some form is a legal beverage in all of the states. At the same time most states have made provision in their statutes for local option. That is, municipal or county units may, upon vote of their citizens, declare illegal within their bounds any sale of alcoholic beverages.

Gradually limited areas in many states are availing of these statutes, and dry territory is again spreading though it is still far from the extent which such territory attained before the regime of national prohibition was inaugurated in 1919. The present extensions are sufficiently menacing to the liquor traffic to arouse considerable alarm among the interests centered in this traffic. Manufacturers and vendors of alcoholic beverages, in the organs of the trade, are voicing this alarm in no uncertain terms, and sponsors of the dry movement are not less vocal in their exultation.

The limitations of this movement are, however, generally recognized by rank-and-file citizenry. However effective local option may have been in "horse-and-buggy" days, the present facilities for transportation render prohibitory statutes ineffective even in the largest units now subject to local option provisions. In smaller municipal units elements in the population who desire to do so can readily make such measures farcical.

A great variety of programs of liquor control have been inaugurated among the 48 states of the American Union. So far there appears little disposition for any of them to depart from the system originally adopted, various as those systems are. This is natural. Six years allow but a brief period for experimentation, and states will be induced to change from one system to another only after clear demonstration of defects in their own and superiority in the procedure of neighboring states.

Nevertheless, a value in our American federal system is being demonstrated in this field, as it has been demonstrated in many others: it affords large opportunity for experimentation. Some sort of control of the traffic is universally recognized to be essential. Manufacturers and vendors of liquors are themselves scarcely behind other citizens in recognizing this. On the other hand, there appears little prospect of the re-adoption of prohibition on a large scale. Most of the advocates of this program as an ultimate goal now recognize the futility of applying the measure in any population which is not a virtual unit in personal abstinence. Habitual addicts will secure their liquor supplies at whatever affront to the community's desires or mandates. That has been demonstrated to be the moral effect of addiction.

(*Continued on page* 164)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1940 No. 10

WAR THE TEST

It occurs to me that the day will come, and is indeed now here, when the men of today will be judged by their attitude towards the Great War. . . . The Great War has not merely been the test of a man's nobility of character; it has been the test of his devotion to the cause of humanity, to the supreme good of the world. Little enough, as we know, the herd cares for that. But if we want to find out what our would-be spiritual and intellectual leaders are worth, let us search diligently to find out their records during the War. Have they in speech or action encouraged that war? Have they spoken evil of those who fought on the other side? Have they pharisaically asserted their own superior self-righteousness? Have they like imbeciles accepted the empty catchwords of their politicians? If not, it is well, and we may hold up our heads. But else they are judged, for by their own mouths they are declared foul emanations of the passions of the crowd, Poison Gas made Flesh. It is meet they are branded on the brows with the Mark of the Beast to which they have sold what they call their souls. So all their fellows may know whom they had to thank for the blessings of the Great War. And if they show their gratitude by hardening the muscles of their arms, and gathering all the serpents they can find to make a scourge to lash the backs of these leaders until not one of them is left, perhaps, after all, there might not be less joy on earth.

HAVELOCK ELLIS, in *Fountain of Life.*

PRESIDENT, POPE, AND PEACE

UNITY has more than once declared that there are just two persons above all others who can lead the way to peace. The one is the Pope of Rome who symbolizes and to a large extent embodies the conscience of Christendom; and the other is the President of the United States, who represents the public sentiment of the greatest democratic and neutral nation in the world. And now these two, thanks to the initiative of Mr. Roosevelt, are working together, and will continue to work together, until peace is found and war thus ended. In the last war, it will be remembered, the Vatican and the White House never came together. All possibility of such beneficent coöperation was ended when America threw away her divine prerogative of peace by making herself a belligerent on the European battle-front. But now Rome and Washington are clasping hands in an enterprise coincident with the welfare of mankind. At this point, at least, history is *not* repeating itself. The situation today is infinitely better than it was yesterday. For this vastly improved situation, President Roosevelt above all others deserves credit. His letter to the Pope, Dr. Buttrick, and Rabbi Adler was an inspiration, and at the same time an act of consummate statesmanship. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of his appeal, and of the consequences that may follow it. Especially wise as well as brave was the President's action in appointing an unofficial ambassador to represent himself and the country in Rome in the high interests of peace. Picayune to the point of disgust is the attitude of certain Protestants who question the President's action in this regard and would oppose it if they dared. Imagine intruding anti-Catholic prejudice into this momentous business of bringing peace to this troubled planet! This is no time for raking up old woes, and marking anew the dividing lines of party and of sect. The President is to be praised unreservedly for one of the noblest acts in his career, and on his behalf both day and night should prayers be lifted that he may find the way to peace. This would bring ineffable glory to his name, immortal distinction to this nation, and a boon beyond price to the stricken multitudes of Europe. Our own desire is to hold up the President's hand—sustain him, help him, bless him. And may heaven speed his great endeavor!

THE APPEAL TO RELIGION

There is another and quite separate aspect of the President's letter to the Pope et al., which should be emphasized to the full. We refer to the recognition of religion and its power in the affairs of men which was involved in this great event. In the matter of ending war and establishing peace, the President's action may have been only a "gesture," as none other than Mrs. Roosevelt herself stated in her newspaper column. But there was far more than a "gesture" inherent in the head of the American republic reaching out his hand to the representatives of the three great religious faiths of the western world, and asking their coöperation in the momentous business of rescuing mankind from the destructive clutch of militarism. Here is such recognition of the church as a human, if not divine, institution as has not been seen in hundreds of years gone by. More than this is the recognition not merely of the church but of religion itself as the deepest and most potent force that is alive within the hearts of men. Only this last month, in an editorial of sensational significance, the editors of *Fortune* magazine declared that until the nations of the world

returned to ethical and spiritual ideals as the fundamental realities of life, nothing could finally be done to rescue humanity from death. It is this sentiment which has now been transformed into statesmanship by President Roosevelt. By the mere stroke of an inspired pen, this great American has swung the whole vast force of Christianity, in both its Catholic and Protestant branches, and of Judaism, to the side of peace and brotherhood, which is thereby acclaimed their proper business. The act constitutes an epoch of history. After all, when everything has been said and done, it is not out of camps and courts but out of the hearts of men that the issues of life proceed. Jeremiah, ages ago, proclaimed the coming of a day when this should be known. And now, as though the prophet's word were fulfilled, the day is here. *"Not by power, nor by might, but by my spirit, saith the Lord!"* Mr. Roosevelt has heard and answered this injunction, and all the world applauds.

BROTHER HITLER TO BROTHER STALIN

Hitler's birthday telegram to the Soviet Fuehrer, on the occasion of the latter's sixtieth birthday, was a thing to touch the heart. Berlin clasping the hand of Moscow, the Wilhelmstrasse saluting the Kremlin, the Swastika intertwining with the Hammer and Sickle! How sweet and lovely it is for brethren to dwell together in unity—and here we have it in Hitler's "best wishes" to Stalin for his "personal welfare, as well as for a happy future for the peoples of the friendly Soviet Union." Stalin celebrated his birthday by bombing Finnish hospitals and slaughtering Finnish civilians. We know this not because any anti-Red propagandist told us so, but because we heard it over the short-wave radio from a correspondent who had survived the bombing—heard the vast explosions, been peppered with the shrapnel, seen the ruined buildings, and picked up the shattered corpses. Our Communist friends were shocked when this sort of thing was done in Spain by Franco's bombers, and shrieked their protest to high heaven; but we hear not a peep over this horror in Finland. Curious—we cannot see the difference! It's women and children, and homes and hearths, and blood and agony and death, in both cases! But we suppose the flag makes all the difference in the world. Hitler, of course, enjoyed these birthday festivities. This sort of business is right down his alley. Only he specializes in Jews and Bohemian students and Austrian Catholics, whereas Stalin takes Finnish workers for his victims. Blood is indeed thicker than water, and more precious than principles. Drenched in the blood of myriads slain, Adolf and Joseph can clasp hands and join hearts in a kinship which transcends all earlier hatreds and suspicions. But what are the German and Russian people thinking about this blessed fraternity, we wonder? The Germans, taught by the Nazis all these years that they were saving their own country and the world from the hideous menace of Communism, are now ordered to take the viper into their bosoms! And the Russians, taught by the Comintern all these years that they were freeing the workers from their oppressors, are now driven like slaves into the Arctic wastes to murder fishermen and farmers and foresters and factory hands! We think they are thinking a whole lot. The people are not forever fools. Give them time enough, let this Nazi-Communist alliance sink in, and there will be an explosion which will leave the two dear comrades, Hitler and Stalin, looking something like the wreckage of the *Graf Spee.*

THREE HUNDRED MILES

If anything could be amusing in the epic tragedy of the *Graf Spee,* it is the complete indifference with which the combatants treated the 300-mile neutral zone which the American republics at Panama set up around their continents north and south. It was agreed by these republics, led by the United States, that the traditional 3-mile limit offered no protection in a day when a ship's guns can shoot ten miles or more. So the limit was multiplied a hundred times, and all belligerents warned to keep off. And the very first time the decree was needed, it was completely ignored. The *Graf Spee,* pursued by the English cruisers, made straight for shore, and the cruisers fought their prey to the very mouth of the La Platte. And of course this will happen again, and still again, under like circumstances. As well expect a terrier to abandon a rat at a certain line in the street, as a warship to abandon an enemy at the 300-mile mark! Yet it must be agreed that the 300-mile zone is a splendid idea. Every peace-lover, every believer in strict neutrality, must applaud this regulation and the efforts of the administration to maintain it. It is a part, and a vital part, of our whole determined endeavor to keep out of the war, and the war itself out of our hemisphere. What is to be done? Enforce it, cries many a voice. Establish an armed patrol by joint action of North and South American navies, and fight off any ship, German, French, or British, which attempts to cross the 300-mile line. But this is getting into the war with a vengeance, isn't it? It is like every other attempt to enforce peace, or security, or neutrality—namely, going to war in order to prevent war! If, in our own interest, we are going to fight every belligerent in sight, and thus make the war indeed a universal war, then we had better get in on one side or the other and finish the thing up. No, there is no remedy here. Force gets us just nowhere at all. In the very attempt to win security, we lose it, and ourselves spread havoc far and wide. The 300-mile regulation is all to the good. But it must be maintained not by guns, but by the rigorous opinion and will of a great segment of mankind which must in the end prevail.

ARE WE IN FOR REACTION?

Secretary Ickes wants a conference of liberals in the interest of a liberal candidate for the presidency. He fears that a conservative or reactionary may capture the 1940 election. It looks as though it might be so, with Taft, Dewey, Vandenburg, and Landon the outstanding leaders in the Republican Party, and Garner running strong in his candidacy for the Democratic nomination. The President, of course, may run for a third term, as Mr. Ickes and others want him to do, as the undisputed leader of American liberalism; but such action would only split his party and leave the election wide open to the Republicans. It is a sorry spectacle. But so is the plight of liberalism everywhere. The disintegration of the forces of progress and enlightenment is appalling—and the cause not far to seek. It is all to be found in the fact that we liberals are not faithful to our own ideals. We are always ready to compromise. Thus, we play fast and loose with war, all too many of us finding reason to support a war, or apologize for it, and furnish arms and ammunition and money for it. War has no place in the economy of liberalism, as the nineteenth century liberals understood well enough, but ever since 1914, liberals have been ready to support "a good war," and then stand amazed that such war brings nothing but disaster. In the same way, we liberals have toyed with Russia. Our motives were good—we were thrilled by the social experiment which the Revolution was presenting as a substitute for capitalism! But, in our enthusiasm for the new economy, we let ourselves defend, or at least extenuate, the political tyranny which the Soviets had imposed upon the Russian people, with its denial of all those basic human rights which are central to the liberal cause. And now Russia stands revealed in the naked horror of Finland—and the whole liberal world is in flight before the jeering hosts of reaction! So, also, with the New Deal! Its motives have been splendid, its sympathies for the great masses of the common people sublime, much of its leadership superb. But again and again the New Deal has done things which compromise its own purposes, and even defy fundamental standards of decency and honor. And the liberals of America have refused to discriminate and pass judgment, but have rather swallowed everything on the plea that the end justifies the means. And now the New Deal is on the run, and conservatism in hot and happy pursuit. Let us not fool ourselves! We liberals have betrayed ourselves. We have but one thing to do, if we are to save our nation and the world from black reaction, and that is to return to our principles, and be faithful to them.

THE SOUL OF HEYWOOD BROUN

The case of the late Heywood Broun is likely to go down in religious history as one of the most interesting varieties of spiritual experience in our time. Only a short while before his death, as everybody knows, Broun joined the Roman Catholic Church, and thus became a distinguished member of that distinguished company of converts which includes such names as G. K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Alfred Noyes, Ronald Knox, and William E. Orchard. What was it that led Heywood Broun to these ancient altars? A search for peace—a haven of rest where the tumults of the world and the torments of his own soul might be stilled. In the world, Broun was a lover of his kind whose sensitive heart was well-nigh broken by the spectacle of injustice and the havoc it wrought among humanity. He could never get out of his consciousness in these times the thought of bread lines and relief stations, broken homes and starving lives, and the long misery of Europe in war and in a peace that was as bad as war. He tried to find comfort and distraction in night-clubs and speak-easies and race-tracks, and, more creditably in social reform and Socialism and the New Deal and his own abounding charities. But nothing availed! Then there was not only the world to torture him, but his soul as well. For Heywood Broun was all his life a dual personality which was perpetually in a state of inner civil war. On the one hand, he was the Puritan, who hated iniquity, despised unrighteousness, and reverenced the moral law. On the other hand was the *bon vivant,* who enjoyed living, revelled in human comradeship, and rebelled at inhibitions as inverted exhibitions of weakness. Inwardly the two sides of his nature tore at one another, and not all the jovial front of his daily life could hide the agony within. In later years, the torment affected his writing, which lost much of its old ease and power. There had to be some resolution of his disharmony if he was not to perish utterly, and he found it at last in Rome, where many a distracted soul has attained to peace. Heywood Broun was one of the most lovable and pitiful of men. He had myriads of friends, and no enemy. Death will be very kind to him.

Jottings

Since our list of the famous dead in 1939 was published in the last issue, the following have died: Anthony Fokker, aeroplane designer and builder; Henry L. Doherty, oil magnate and public utilities leader; Sir Frank Benson, famous Shakesperean actor of England, and ex-Representative A. P. Pujo, chairman of the once-famous Pujo Committee.

What would we think of a person who spoke of a "divorced marriage"? The same thing that we ought to think of a person who speaks of an "armed peace."

Scuttling a ship has never been rated a deed of heroism. Yet the Nazis are resorting to it as instinctively as a duck to water. What is the explanation?

From an ad. of Teacher's Scotch Whiskey:

"May guid luck follow ye
An'—no maittur how fast ye gae—
May it always keep oop wi' ye."

("May good luck follow you
And—no matter how fast you go—
May it always keep up with you.")

Thanks so much! If it hadn't been for that translation, we never could have imagined what it was all about.

Since the beginning of the War, 321 persons have been killed in railroad accidents in Germany. In one day (December 23rd), 184 persons were so killed. Thus again are we being taught that, in this war, life at home is far more dangerous than life at the front.

Russians in Finland are now learning what the soldiers of Napoleon suffered in the retreat from Moscow. Old General Winter, most efficient of tacticians, is today the enemy of the Russians, as one hundred years ago he was their ally.

J. H. H.

What Is Pacifism?

Opposition to war may spring from various sources, be prompted by various ideas, and be compromised by various conditions.

Thus, it may be opposition to war because the war in question is being fought for base imperialistic purposes. But there may be other wars fought ostensibly for great causes of justice and liberation, and these wars, it is said, must be supported! It was on grounds of this kind that certain men who opposed the war of 1914, vigorously supported the Loyalist war against Franco in Spain. It is on similar grounds that these same men, or others of the same type, are supporting the present war against Hitler in Germany. Romain Rolland is here a conspicuous example. Opposition to war, from this point of view, is determined by the circumstances under which the war is being fought, or the causes which it is meant to serve. It all depends! But this is not pacifism. For pacifism, in the true sense of the word, means opposition to all wars. There are no circumstances or causes which can justify mass murder.

Again, there may be opposition to war which in reality is opposition to the government which is fighting the war. Get rid of this government and put another in its place, and the war may suddenly become all right! This was Lenin's attitude during the first two years and more of the Great War. He advocated "defeatism," as it was called—i.e., opposition to the war in the interest of a defeat which would bring in its wake revolution. But Lenin was no pacifist. He was a consistent Communist who saw in the Great War, more particularly in defeat in this war, a chance to overthrow the capitalist governments which were fighting it. As soon as the Tsar's regime was overthrown and he was master of Russia, he was ready to fight any power anywhere which opposed his rule. But the true pacifist is not ready to fight at all. He is opposed to fighting on principle.

Again, there may be opposition to war which is opposition only to aggressive war. If a war is being fought against an invader of one's native soil, or by some helpless little people set upon by some ruthless conqueror, then it is deemed a good war. There are plenty of people, for example, who are absolutely opposed to this country's going into the present war, and who are not interested in the imperialist struggle between the Tories of Britain and the Nazis of Germany, but who would fight gladly for Finland against Russia, as they would have fought gladly for Czechoslovakia against Germany and for Ethiopia against Italy, and always for their own country against any invader. These people, however, are not pacifists. For pacifists are objectors to war on a basis of conscience. They find the process itself wrong, and thus must repudiate it utterly.

It is this absolute and thoroughgoing opposition to war which is alone *pacifism*. It is an opposition which is fundamentally moral. All other forms of opposition to war are aspects of expediency, which are rooted not in principles but in events, and thus are liable at any moment to compromise or surrender. It is the halfway or conditional pacifist, so-called, who is always being convinced that *this* war, in contrast to the last war as seen in retrospect, and the next war as seen in prospect, is a justifiable war. Undoubtedly the war of 1914 was a wretched struggle for colonial territories and foreign markets; undoubtedly any future war will be a duel of brutish conquerors who have enslaved the peoples to their murderous uses! But *this* war—THIS is different! *This* is a holy cause. We must fight, or be forever disgraced.

Of course it is this halfway or conditional type of pacifist, if we may call him such at all, against whom all the barrages of propaganda are directed. See the multitudes of men and women, thousands of them boys and girls in the colleges, who were against all war in 1930, and 1931, and 1932-37; and then began to hem and haw in 1938 and 1939; and today at last are full-

fledged supporters of the present war! Yesterday, they were rapturously taking the Oxford Oath; today, they are as rapturously taking the oath to King and Country. What has happened? The same thing that happened in the last war, and will happen again in the next war. Propaganda has worked its miracle of changing an imperialistic war into a holy crusade, for no other reason than that it is being fought *now*, and therefore can be made to seem one more crisis in civilization.

To such propaganda the genuine pacifist is immune. He has thought his problem through. He has laid hold upon deep-founded principles of the moral life. He has seen clear visions of the spirit like the fixed stars in heaven. He knows that war solves no problems; that war aggravates dissensions, distrusts, and hatreds; that war destroys victors along with vanquished; that war is murder, and therefore wrong. There is no greater wrong. Every other evil is a lesser evil. "War," said the great Channing, "is the concentration of all crime." Therefore will the pacifist have nothing to do with it. He takes his stand, as did Mahatma Gandhi, when asked about the Czechoslovakian crisis:

> If there ever would be a justifiable war in the name of and for humanity, a war against Germany to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race would be completely justified. *But I do not believe in any war.* A discussion of the pros and cons of such a war is therefore outside my horizon or province.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

For Every Child Under the American Flag

MIRIAM ZIONY

Contrary to popular knowledge as well as that of the Republican party spokesman who suggested some months ago that the only way his party could redeem itself was by becoming more conservative, it was during a Republican administration that the needs of the forgotten man—in terms of the needs and rights of the forgotten children of this country—were first proclaimed.

In November, 1930, at the request of President Hoover, there met in Washington the third White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, described by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Chairman of the Conference, and at that time Secretary of the Interior, as a notable gathering of "3,000 men and women, leaders in the medical, educational, and social fields as they touch the life of the child."

The purpose of the Conference, Dr. Wilbur wrote later, was in the words of Mr. Hoover when he announced its convocation in July, 1929, "to study the present status of the health and well-being of the children of the United States and its possessions; to report what is being done; to recommend what ought to be done and how to do it."

On the basis of years of experience in their respective fields, through scientific study and evaluation of research data already on hand, through information obtained by the use of extensive interviews and questionnaires for more than a year before the Conference was convened, the delegates indicated the facilities available in public and private agencies for promoting child welfare, described at length the overwhelming need for improvement of conditions and the extension of opportunities, and in the closing session of the Conference, drew up a *Children's Charter* of nineteen points envisaging among other things: "For every child a community which recognizes and plans for his needs; protects him against physical dangers, moral hazards, and disease; provides him with safe and wholesome places for play and recreation; and makes provision for his cultural and social needs," and "for every child the right to grow up in a family with an adequate standard of living and the security of a stable income as the surest safeguard against social handicaps."

"We must get to the cause of their handicaps from the beginning of their lives. We must extend the functions of our schools and institutions to help them as they grow. We must enlarge the services of medical inspection and clinics, expand the ministrations of the family doctor in their behalf and very greatly increase the hospital facilities for them. We must not leave one of them uncared for," said Mr. Hoover in his opening address to the Conference.

"There has not been before the summation of knowledge and experience, such as lies before this Conference. There has been no period when it could be undertaken with so much experience and background. The Nation looks to you to derive from it positive, definite guiding judgments," he told the assembled delegates, "but greater than the facts and the judgments, more fundamental than all, we need the vision and the inspired understanding to interpret these facts and put them into practice. . . . It will rest with you to light the fires of that inspiration in the general public conscience, and from conscience lead it into action."

Conference findings indicated that 6,000,000 children in the United States were improperly nourished; 1,000,000 had defective speech; 1,000,000 had weak or damaged hearts; 675,000 had behavior problems; 450,000 were mentally retarded; 382,000 were tubercular; 3,000,000 had defective hearing; 18,000 were totally deaf; 300,000 were crippled; 64,000 were either totally or partially blind; 200,000 were delinquent; 500,000 children were dependents, and "more than 80 per cent" of them were "not receiving the necessary attention, though our knowledge and experience show that these deficiencies can be prevented and remedied to a high degree."*

Unemployment and insufficient wages, poor housing and unsanitary surroundings, child labor, lack of facilities for parental education in scientific methods of child care, inadequate facilities for the prevention and control of communicable diseases, insufficient opportunity for recreation and play, for individualized instruction and vocational guidance, etc., were found to be an ever-present threat to the health and happiness and development even of the millions of normal children in

**White House Conference on Child Health and Protection* 1930, *Addresses and Abstracts of Committee Reports.* D. Appleton-Century Company.

this country. State and federal aid were recommended by the Conference committees as means of meeting the need.

The message of the Conference traveled far and wide but little could be done to promote its aims; the depression was already upon us. Even such welfare programs as were in existence, because of decreasing contributions and lowered budgets, were to the consternation and despair of welfare workers everywhere being curtailed and suspended.

Instead of an increase in the standard of living, the problem became one of giving the unemployed enough food to stave off the pangs of hunger from day to day. Instead of an enlargement of services in the form of nursery schools, educational, and recreational facilities, there were, as everyone knows, closing schools and classes and unpaid teachers. Instead of opening new clinics and hospitals and training centers for the physically and mentally handicapped, both public and private institutions had to reduce their staffs and cut their accommodations.

Then, when the welfare picture seemed darkest, a "New Deal" was inaugurated and the machinery of government was set in motion to help provide, on a national scale, not only food and work and the greater surety of savings and of homes for millions of individuals and families that, as victims of the depression, were being deprived of their food and their savings, their work and their homes, but also a larger measure of facilities for safeguarding and enriching the lives of these and other human beings—facilities which because of lack of awareness of need, because of indifference, or because of insufficient funds in state and local areas were unavailable or inadequate even in our most prosperous days.

As the extent of the unemployment problem, the significance of its effects, and the importance of rehabilitation and reconstruction have grown more and more universally apparent through observation and study, the federal government in coöperation with the states has expanded its program through its permanent bureaus and through the creation of various emergency agencies.

With the help of the government, at a time when loans were not forthcoming elsewhere, several million home owners have since 1933 been enabled to save their homes from foreclosure or to make necessary improvements; hundreds of thousands of farm families have been aided with loans and grants. Slum clearance, subsistence homesteads and resettlement projects have not only provided work for many who otherwise would have been on the dole, but are bringing to an increasing number better living standards and more healthful surroundings than they have ever had before.

In answer to those who believe that the dole is the only type of relief that the government should make available in a democratic country, there was issued in the fall of 1936 by the Works Progress Administration a pamphlet called *Jobs* which describes briefly and graphically what was achieved in the previous three years through a program under which "Three and a half million destitute men and women [were] taken from the humiliating futility of relief and put to work on 100,000 useful public projects of W.P.A. and other agencies."

"The primary job was to save human beings . . .," says the report. "While much of the W.P.A.'s work can be physically appraised, the bulk of it carries additional social and human value." All types of workers from unskilled laborers to the most highly trained technicians have had a share in the work done. Thousands of schools have been built or repaired; thousands of other public buildings including hospitals, courthouses, libraries, gymnasiums, community and recreation centers have been constructed or renovated; numerous water and sewer plants have been built or repaired and electric systems installed.

The record of achievement in terms of roads and bridges, parks and sewage systems, hospitals and schools, recreational, educational, and medical facilities that have been provided, is truly manifold and impressive. The work relief activities so much derided and criticized as unnecessary and wasteful are proving to be a boon rather than a boondoggle to many a community. The need of finding jobs for the unemployed, paradoxically enough, at a time when the depression was at its height, gave impetus to the extension of welfare programs and the eradication of those conditions which, as clearly pointed out for many years by welfare workers, have made for delinquency and crime, for physical and mental ill health.

From 1932 to 1934, as shown by Miss Katherine F. Lenroot, Director of the Children's Bureau, in an article on the "Welfare of Children" published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in May, 1935, not only were private expenditures for nursing and child health activities diminishing but there were reductions in state health department appropriations in nearly every state; in five states no such appropriations were made at all from 1932 to 1933. At the beginning of October, 1933, a National Conference was called in Washington by the Secretary of Labor and the Children's Bureau on the problems of Child Health Recovery and on the development of ways and means of checking the undernourishment and malnutrition which the economic situation was steadily increasing. As a result of this Conference, which was attended by representatives of state health departments, medical societies, and child welfare agencies from many states, a Child Health Recovery program of action was developed by the various states and territories in coöperation with the federal government, state relief directors, state health departments, and a number of private organizations. To supplement the subsistence allowance being granted to families on relief, and for the benefit of those who while not yet on relief were suffering also because of insufficient income, appropriations for school lunches and facilities for the examination of children thought to be malnourished were extended. A special leaflet was prepared by the Children's Bureau giving suggestions to parents and others on proper diet, habits of eating, sleep, and rest, exercise and outdoor play, and correction of physical defects. This leaflet was widely distributed. Thousands of unemployed nurses, doctors, and dentists were put to work in clinics, health centers, etc., to take care of the needy and to raise public health standards and services. Orthopedic appliances and corrective treatments have been given to large numbers of the physically handicapped who could not afford to pay for them. With the passage of the Social Security Act in August, 1935, and the allotment of funds through the Children's Bureau and the United States Public Health Service further expansion has been made possible in medical research and investigation, in the establishment of new local health units, in better training for

nursing and medical staff, in maternal and child health work, aid to dependent children, to the crippled and the blind, whose needs the White House Conference of 1930 had stressed.

For many years parents' associations, community councils, and other public-spirited groups have urged that more playgrounds and play facilities be provided, in crowded urban areas particularly, as a means of reducing street accidents and combatting juvenile delinquency. Through the work relief program thousands of parks and playgrounds have been constructed or rebuilt in all parts of the United States; numbers of swimming pools and tennis courts and athletic fields have been built; nursery schools for the care of very young children from impoverished homes, and summer day camps, have been provided.

A study made more than eight years ago of social and economic conditions in a certain New York City area where delinquency was most prevalent revealed the facts that there was not one playground in the entire area and that the boys of the neighborhood had to depend for amusement on pool parlors and questionable moving picture theatres. The building of playgrounds and recreation centers was recommended in the study but even the richest city in the world could not afford to carry out those recommendations until the allocation of W.P.A. money began to turn a dream into reality. Three summers ago the first playground and swimming pool were opened. Additional opportunities for more wholesome play and for better understanding and adjustment of the problems of the children in this and in numerous other localities have been made possible through the assignment of emergency workers to school playgrounds, which formerly were kept locked and barred after school hours because of lack of supervisory staff; in the formation of arts and crafts clubs and classes for children as well as for adults; in English classes and child study classes for parents; in remedial work in reading and arithmetic for pupils who because of inability to grasp those subjects without specialized and individualized attention were in danger of developing inferiority feelings and anti-social attitudes; and in the use of child guidance and psychiatric workers from emergency rolls where such workers are not obtainable under the regular budget.

The youth problem in America has been widely discussed. While still far from being an entirely adequate or a permanent solution, the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration are making possible for hundreds of thousands of young people a better education, vocational guidance and training, and an opportunity to do some constructive work instead of wasting their time and energies in complete idleness and discouragement.

"It is a dramatic thought," it has been said, "that perhaps the very people who suffered most when America's economic machinery went to pieces, will contribute most in repairing it." The census of the six million eligible workers on relief in March, 1935, showed them to be divided into more than 150 occupational categories subdivided under classifications such as: farm operators and laborers; domestic and personal service workers; unskilled laborers; semi-skilled workers in manufacturing and other industries; semi-skilled workers in building and construction; skilled workers and foremen in manufacturing and other industries; skilled workers and foremen in building and construction; salesmen and kindred workers; office workers; proprietors, managers and officials; professional and technical workers; and inexperienced persons. Because of insufficient funds with which to put them to work, several million of the unemployed are still on direct relief and many who have been granted work are financially no better, or little better off, than when they were on the dole. But the chance to work, either in their own fields or in some other field if necessary, has given a new lease on life to the emergency workers, and their productivity is adding immeasurably to the life and enjoyment of the nation.

The greatest significance of the emergency program lies in its implications and in what it presages for the future. Out of our national economic calamity has come not only a great constructive effort and achievement for the common good but what is more important, a clearer appreciation of the common need, a stronger sense of responsibility and a newer attitude regarding the function of government in promoting the general welfare.

The worthwhileness of the various emergency projects is being increasingly realized. No longer is federal assistance looked upon as paternalism or encroachment upon state rights. Instead, both state and local authorities are appealing to the national government for further aid so that these projects may be incorporated in their regular programs.

Here in the United States we have been building on a national scale during the last few years, more or less haphazardly perhaps, but with the help and for the benefit of all groups and races and classes rather than to the detriment of, or by persecution of, any particular group. Freedom of public criticism and discussion, and Congressional and Supreme Court action have made, and should continue even more thoroughly to make, correction and limitation of power possible whenever the bounds of good judgment or honesty of purpose or liberty have been overstepped.

With one-third of our population still ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, there is much constructive work left to be done; and there are millions of persons out of work and eager for the chance to do it. Only as we continue to seek the means through private endeavor and through the extension of government assistance and initiative where private endeavor and private funds are limited, can we ever hope to approach that goal set forth for us, not by Moscow, but by a Republican administration in a *Children's Charter* of rights "for every child . . . regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live under the protection of the American flag."

Not by furnishing the means for multiplying the numbers of the hungry and homeless, the dead and the desolate in the European conflict will our own democracy be preserved or our own prosperity and happiness be increased. A "war-inspired recovery" and the solution of our unemployment problem through the sale of war materials, either for offensive or defensive purposes, would be but bitter bread upon the waters.

Only by mobilizing now in a mightier united drive for peacetime construction and more creative utilization of those energies and resources which we are once again preparing to sacrifice to the god of battle can we light the way for the distraught and hopeless in other lands and under other flags—and help to hasten the day when poverty and the poor shall no longer be with us, neither poverty in material things nor in things of the mind and the spirit.

Let Britain Answer!

RATTAN S. SEKHON

Consideration of any more concessions to the Indians in the government of India has been postponed until the end of the present war. The spokesmen for His Majesty's Government have announced that they have no faith in the ability of the Indians to handle, during these critical days, any more responsibility than they already have—which is very little. The people of India, under the long tutelage of the British, have failed to learn the art of self-government, an art known to the Indians for centuries. There are a number of historians who maintain that India, through the village community, is the mother of self-government and democracy. People whose early ancestors are very highly thought of for their contributions to religion, philosophy, art, literature, civics, and science are poor and inadequate pupils in the eyes of their English masters! The record of their progress over more than half a century under British leadership is shockingly poor. The few rights granted to the Indians in the affairs of the government of India indicate that even the A B C of self-government is beyond them.

Besides the opinions of the people representing British interests in India, no evidence of the decay of Indian intelligence exists. No evidence even of the trend of such decay is found in any published research in social science, education, sociology, psychology, etc. India's present contributions to the advancement of man are very humble. Only two of her sons have won the Nobel Prize; one in literature and the other in science. There may be many other potential Nobel Prize winners among the Indians but they are denied educational facilities. Great Britain is largely responsible for this illiteracy as well as the poverty of India. For the disgrace of withholding liberty from India, Britain blames the Indians instead of her own greed and ambition to maintain her Empire.

India under Britain remains sunk in the ocean of medieval darkness which glorified superstitions and permitted intolerable social evils. Long after the practice of witch burning vanished through law enforcement in the West, India tolerated the practice of the "suttee system" or cremation of widows. The lamp of science burns dimly in India. People fumble in the darkness of ignorance, and disgracing superstitions and horrible customs still prevail. On the soil of India, cows are sacred but human beings are untouchable. Ideals of democracy which destroyed serfdom in Europe and caused the downfall of monarchies and aristocracies have not penetrated India. Under the protection of Britain, hundreds of native sultans continue their harems and despotic living while a native farmer, unprotected from the tropical heat and disease, toils and suffers. Under peculiar bondage approximating slavery, he knows neither minimum wages nor hours. He still is a beast of burden.

Human and social applications of science, which are so common and frequent in the West, are not the lot of the people of India. The country, as a whole, is hopelessly backward in its development. Industry and agriculture are both still in a primitive stage. Railroads and a few other developments which catch the eye of the traveler, have been built chiefly to facilitate governmental work and for the comfort of high moguls from Great Britain. Their benefit to India and her people is incidental and was not intended.

The story of India's fight for freedom is the story of her effort to break away from the medieval ideas and the institutions which once ruled the whole civilized world. Early leaders of the Indian National Congress Party, founded in 1885, pleaded for the coöperation of His Majesty's Government in fighting the superstitions and social evils of India through universal education and law. Great Britain coöperated with the Indian educators, social reformers, and industrialists after a fashion, but she withheld her true skill and genuine sympathy from causes that were purely Indian. Up until the beginning of the World War the Congress Party included little more in its program than equality before law, freedom of thought, speech and publication for the people of India, as well as gradual realization of dominion status for India in the distant future. In 1919 a new light of truth dawned upon the leaders of the Congress Party. They had suspected it before. But after the World War they were convinced forever that there would be no home rule for India if Britain were able to prevent it. The deceived Congress Party, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, declared a war without violence for the freedom of India. For the last twenty years the Nationalists have been carrying on this war through non-coöperation, boycott of British goods, and civil disobedience. Britain has been fighting it with London Round Table Conferences, various ordinances, police clubs, and sometimes with machine guns.

During the World War a revolution in India was expected. A German writer said: "We expected that British India would rise when the first shot was fired in Europe, but in fact thousands of Indians came to fight with the British against us." Britain then needed and sought India's full coöperation. She promised the Indian leaders home rule for India at the end of the World War. Innocent and trusting Indians suspended the Revolutionary Movement and remained loyal to Britain until the victory. India helped to win the war with her wealth and men. Her material contribution ran over two billion dollars and she served the cause of democracy with more than a million of her sons. Thousands of them were killed and wounded in eastern and western Europe. The combined troops of the dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa were less in number than the Indian soldiers who fought for Great Britain in the World War. The Indian soldiers gave a good account of themselves on both the eastern and western fronts. Their deeds of bravery have never been popularized but in the tedious language of arithmetic they are buried in the shelves of libraries for the historians, scholars, and hunters of facts.

After the war was won, Britain refused to fulfill her pledge, made through her spokesman, Mr. Edwin Montagu, then Secretary of State for India. The reward for the great loyalty and heroic sacrifices of the Indians in the war for Britain was not home rule for India, but the Rowlatt Acts. The Rowlatt Acts (or the Black Acts as they are known among the Indians) were devised and issued in 1919 to suppress the cry of the deceived Indians for justice. The story of the Rowlatt Acts is too long to relate here. It is full of

sad incidents. The most ignoble deed in the story is the massacre of Amritsar. On April 13, 1919, General Dyer, without warning, opened fire on the Hindus who gathered in an extinct garden surrounded with high walls on every side to celebrate a religious festival. I possess no authentic statistics that I can quote with clear conscience, as to how many people were in the garden, how many of them were shot dead on the spot, and how many of them were wounded and died later. Many thousands were there, and over a thousand were killed. The Hindus boost the figures, the British estimate is very conservative. But no fair-minded historian can ignore the shocking truth of the massacre of Amritsar.

The sad memories of the World War and what followed it in India are still fresh in the minds of the Indian leaders, and their wounds are still raw. India is still under the leadership of disillusioned Gandhi who was betrayed by the British after the World War. At the outbreak of the present war in Europe, the leaders of the Indian National Congress Party pressed the Viceroy of India to state specifically the aims of the present war with special reference to India. While lending their full moral support to the Allies before actually advocating participation in the present war, they asked Britain to relax her imperialistic grip and give India her due freedom as an evidence of Britain's good faith in the ideals of democracy.

The Viceroy's announcement of adjourning the subject of dominion status for India until the end of the present war creates doubt in the mind of everyone as to whether Great Britain is fighting for the ideals of democracy or to safeguard her colonial interests and preserve the prestige of the Empire. Indians have been asked to straighten their internal affairs, to come to an understanding with the Princes of India and so solve their problem of minority. At the end of the war the spokesmen of His Majesty's Government will resume the discussion regarding granting more concessions to the Indians in the government of their country. Not even a gesture pregnant with the remote possibility of home rule for India has been made. India has not been spared the burden of the war. The British government of India has already dispatched the Indian troops to Singapore and Egypt. To bear the burden of a war without a cause of their own and to suspend the Nationalist Movement for a good cause, is too big a sacrifice to demand from the people of India. How can the British, who are fighting for the ideals of democracy and justice, make such a demand?

Indians who have defended the English Empire in India and abroad can also defend their own country. That Russia, Japan, or some other power is looking for a chance to grab India is Britain's alibi. India is not a child to believe a "bogey man" is around the corner just because the British "papa" says so. That India is not ready for home rule is a lame excuse. The most glaring and unsolved problem in the democratic form of government is the problem of a minority group. It is a cancer sore in every democracy. Every student of government knows this. All the democracies have it. England has it. The question in the mind of every intelligent man and woman is why its presence in India is depriving the Indians of their right for self-determination. Let Britain answer it!

The war is on. India is included in it with the Allies against Germany. Disappointed in the present policy of the British Government in India, Gandhi has joined with the more radical leaders of the Congress Party in declaring "that there will be no democracy for India if Britain can prevent it." Nothing less than home rule for India will get the coöperation of the Congress Party, which has the majority in eight of the eleven autonomous provinces of India. The British bank on the Indian Princes and the Mohammedans, the so-called minority group, against the non-coöperation and possible civil disobedience of the Congress Party. Everybody wants to know and nobody really knows what will happen in India. Will Indian leaders turn to dictators for sympathy and help? Will the British, engaged in a war of life and death with Hitler, succeed in crushing the Indian Nationalist Movement?

The dictators of Europe are very unpopular in India. The sound of the bugles of the Communist and Fascist propagandas does not lure the ear of India. The India of Buddha and Gandhi cannot swallow Communism and Fascism, neither can Communism and Fascism swallow India. India is behind Gandhi who is a relentless denouncer of Communism and Fascism and who approves of neither Hitler nor Stalin. The Indian people are too religious to welcome Hitler or Stalin who are foes of religion and liberty. Under the well-tailored suit of gray English flannel, a Hindu is still a naked fakir. He is still too proud to sacrifice the higher truth for the mere comfort of the body. India is not yet ready to trade her temples of worship for factories and laboratories. She wants both. She wants democracy. She sees hope in capitalistic democracy. But she looks with despair at Communistic and Fascistic imperialism. The India of today may listen to the sad story of Marx against the theory of *laissez-faire* and imperialism. But she is neither ready to worship Lenin nor to obey Stalin and Hitler. If the future scheme of things is for the world to embrace Communism, India will be the last country to bow her head in submission before a social force which was brought into existence by the greed of a few capitalists, who accumulate wealth to later distribute it among the workers through philanthrophy, wasteful and careless heirs, or high taxes and charity—instead of giving it to them through living and steady wages to preserve the dignity of the "man in blue overalls."

The people of India love and respect Gandhi. They fear and obey the British. The Princes of India, the leaders of the so-called minority groups and the conservatives join with Gandhi and the Congress Party in sympathy for their people. Their spirit is with the Nationalist Movement. The British have merely captured the temptation of the Princes for material possessions and cannot bank on it too heavily. They know the truth well, that they are the pariahs of India as far as Britain and the rest of the world are concerned. With all their wealth and the British-bestowed titles of Sir, Khan, Sardar, etc., they still do not command respect. They sense this more keenly today than ever before.

The roots of the Nationalist Movement have gone deep into the soil of India and into the hearts of the Indians. No tempest can root out this mighty oak of human hope. The Nationalist Movement has now spread among all the villages of India. The voice to free India comes from all over. It is no longer localized in Bengal and the Punjab alone. Thousands of Indians all over the country are striving for the honor of going to the British-Indian jails for the freedom of their motherland. The bayonets of Bengal lancers cannot kill the Nationalist Movement, nor can the Lewis machine-guns annihilate it.

My Pacifism Stands*

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

Just as surely as Copernicus was right in his claim that the earth went round the sun, the pacifist today is right in asserting that the orbit of civilization swings round peace and that nations which swing off to the attraction of war swing inexorably toward darkness and extinction.

Without peace, science hurries us on to destruction. With peace, science geared to coöperative planning and effort can give plenty and more life.

Without peace, nationalism is a cancer feeding on humanity's body. With peace, nationalism can exchange and contribute welfare to the human whole.

Without peace, "collective security" is collective suicide. With disarmament and peaceful change of the status quo, the foundations of universal security can be laid.

Without war-refusing conscientious pacifism which abstains from even defensive war, there will be no sufficient disarmament, no adequate push for peaceful change, no force of religion strong enough to give the peacemakers conquering courage. With positive pacifism of pioneering groups demonstrating non-violent methods of overcoming violence and injustice—Gandhi of India, for example—there will come within reach the tools and technique to prove the pacifist hypothesis, to build a warless civilized world.

So, from many angles the truth of the pacifist thesis is breaking through. More and more it will be seen that all the civilizing influences in society, the *elan vital* in human nature, the deepest things in God revolve in an orbit and order of peace. It is not the use of "force," not the struggle between tooth and claw, not competitive killing that makes the world go round. Civilization must evolve out of this or perish.

The foregoing propositions are to my mind axioms of truth. Nothing in the three wars now raging, nothing that has happened since 1914 disproves them. Rather do they stand the more sure. Beaten upon by the floods, they are rock; tried by fire, they are precious metal; in the present night of storm and darkness, they are light.

Every day that the wars of the present proceed, there is turned up fresh evidence of war's incompatibility with civilization. Commerce and shipping are preyed upon, cities are blacked out by night, children are moved from their homes for the war's duration, taxation mounts to unprecedented heights, military slavery lays hands on the fittest youth, censorship and propaganda obscure truth and stimulate brute passion, while liberty everywhere is more and more tramped under. These are the things which happen in every land at war. Even if it fight for the cause of freedom and in self defense, the above actualities of modern warfare now leap across all military barriers. No longer can civilization be protected by any Maginot Line. War, like influenza or the Black Death, infects peoples and strikes at civilization's vital centers.

Such evidence is grist for the pacifist mill. It will teach men far more powerfully than do our words. Terrible as are the sorrows of the present and sympathetically as I must identify myself with the sufferings of the afflicted, there is consolation in my soul and underlying peace because of the conviction that my pacifist thinking is right and that I am privileged to work in a movement that is on a hot scent of reality and discovery and is going to be vindicated; I hope before this century's end.

However, I expect things may get worse before they become better. The contagion of the present wars will, I fear, spread. Populations of the countries which go in may be decimated. A world war may develop but this is not yet inevitable. The peoples in no country want it. The United States and perhaps a majority of the nations can still stay largely out and exert strong pressure for cessation of the fighting and for peace by reason and negotiation. It is inevitable that the killing must some day end. Pacifists in the United States should join every campaign and movement which is directed toward skipping the war and bringing *peace now*. So long as that fails they should still do all that they can to keep our country out of the battle. Although we are already part way in, each new step that would take us further in should be resisted with our utmost endeavor.

Besides this vitally important work, the clear-sighted pacifist must labor to keep reason alive, hope active, courage and calmness prevailing in his own soul and in the hearts of those with whom he has contact. Recently, one of the German Confessional pastors imprisoned for his faith, wrote home saying, "though on the surface it may be rough weather, twenty fathoms down it is quite calm." We can be unshaken if our pacifism goes *deep* into reality.

*Written as a part of the "Challenge to Pacifists" symposium published in our November 6th issue. Mr. Sayre is chairman of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.—*Editor.*

Water from the Rock

TRACY D. MYGATT

Moonlight. Moonlight that kept me staring broad awake, past garden and autumn trees, their flaring gold and scarlet softened to mystic radiance, across to the strange monster reaching up into the night sky, which to my wakeful eyes looked so much less like an Artesian Well-Driller than a gibbet.

Last night I kept thinking of how long it would take—how much longer than until the distant dawn—for each boy who will die on the West Wall to run up that long ladder that they call the "mast," and stand a moment, letting me look deep into his young face before he should be plunged into the great waiting darkness. And I wished that all the militarists, all the warmakers, all the war-correspondents and breathless radio commentators who are dissatisfied at the slowness with which young men are dying, disgruntled by what they call the stalling of the war because it makes their bulletins less dramatic and flattens all their epigrams, could be staring up, instead of myself, at that strange well-driller in the moonlight, haunted by the young forms poised, waiting for the futile, ignoble death.

Rash to venture on analogies. Rash and irresistible! For this morning the well-driller again holds my thoughts. I cannot escape it, nor resist quoting the enthusiastic comment of its guardian, as he gazed in brisk affection at the driller (which is now no gibbet, but merely its shatteringly efficient self again): "The higher the drop, the harder the pound!" Meaningless words to some, but not to us drought-stricken folk. To us it means—for our machine, as has been said, stretches high into the sky—water, speedy water from beneath the rock.

We shall have it yet—Peace. And we who look back to the Great War years (heaven grant that our commentators continue to be disappointed in their ghoulish craving for a Greater War!) we must know that even though we ourselves never consented to that vast violence, never upheld it by jot or tittle, since 1918 we have driven neither hard nor deep enough. Our "bit" and our "casing," our "drive-shoe" and our "centre-jars" were never sufficiently implacable. Even though, in the light of our vision of that new warless world, we looked to the stars, we lacked the steel-forged courage and persistence to bring forth the sweet water of reconciliation that would have gushed out once we had cut deep.

Or perhaps, a little, we may shift the blame, if we are still (albeit profitlessly) obsessed with the question of war guilt. Perhaps we may feel that we pacifists who have tried to preach unequivocal war-resistance and even, as in the Frazier Resolution, unilateral disarmament, have been betrayed in the halfway house of the friends who presented Peace as a creed to be held only so long as this country was not menaced by invasion. Now a creed like this seems to me to have no driving power at all. Not, of course, that there is any real likelihood of invasion. It is pretty silly to think so! And yet, conceivably and for the sake of argument, it could happen with robot-driven planes—even if they are as fantastic as our sober well-driller turned gibbet in a moonlit midnight!

In any case the invasion hypothesis opens all manner of breaches to the militarist by way of "defense" needs. Once granting the necessity to meet the "invasion" bugbear by arms, the pacifist has given half his case away. And army, navy, and air circles will not be slow to steal the other half! Worst of all, those who pander to such compromise cut themselves off completely from any passionate, clear-cut testing out of all the non-violent techniques. And it is precisely these non-violent techniques, this "strategy of love" that we so urgently need to perfect, a strategy which would refuse to be dismayed if a thousand Hitlers—or that one all but legendary and wholly pitiable figure which a friend of mine has well called "the personal devil of the radicals"—should suddenly appear over the horizon's edge.

No, no, any peace that is less than pacifism at its highest and truest is no better than surface water! "The higher the drop, the harder the pound!" Deep, deep we must drill with our strong resistant steel, into the bedrock of men's hearts. And before I leave this to the others who will tell us what we must do to be saved—to save our most dear and beautiful and perishing world!—I would appeal for some of those deeds, those acts beyond letters and books and articles and sermons. I mean acts such as daring, imaginative outdoor demonstrations. "Poster-Walks," perhaps the not too humble beginnings which a few of us have been trying out, where one's own placard-bearing body walking steadfastly along the thronged streets of our cities, becomes no mere cheap exhibitionism but a holy symbol, easily grasped by bewildered men and women. They, too, have their part to play. They have been neglected too long in favor of an inept academicism. It is in their hearts, too, beneath the crusty "hardpan" that the water will be found. . . .

From the glowing autumn garden comes the sound of the driller. Deep and ever deeper. This is no easy task. Mediation is no easy task. But if we would save those boys from a gibbet that is indeed no fantasy, we shall strive for mediation with all our heart and soul. We shall work for a Peace which shall be an all-inclusive, democratic, non-military federation of the states of the whole world. Driving deep with faith, hope, and charity, we shall at last assuage the world's burning thirst.

Early Armament Race

[Saurian Halls, American Museum of Natural History]

What giant nightmare shapes surround us here!—
Portentous skeletons that seem to wait
Lost aeons' call to join fierce Danse Macabre.
Spike-armored, sabre-toothed, prodigious-horned,
But cramped in skull-space for brains infantile,
They loom above mazed human visitors.
What names!—Tyrannosaur and Trachodon,
Deep drums!—Iguanodon and Brontosaur,
With cymbals,—Gorgosaur, Triceratops.
Though quiet of these halls where they are posed
Is scarce disturbed by city's distant sound
Beyond the windows, as of murmuring bees,
Imagination conjures bedlam din
From Mesozoic times of these fell beasts.
Tough flesh and sinews seem to clothe their bones;
From dragon throats again pour howls and roars
Of combats raging through their marshy haunts
And over plains that quake beneath their tread.

No sooner did one monster reptile clan
Achieve advantage in attack, with horns
Of fiercer thrust, or fangs' raw savagery,
Than Evolution wrought for hostile group
New strength of body-armor for defence,
With plates and crests of bone like patterned steel.
So through millenniums of murderous strife
There swayed such rivalry of armaments,
With each contestant ever terrified
Lest some development of alien force
Spell doom to his grim tribe's ascendancy.
But victories were all defeats, and trust
In those horrendous weapons and vast shields
Deceit and death alone. The end is here!—
Colossal helpless skeletons, exhumed
From hundred million years in desert graves,
To stalk and grimace in museum halls.

ELIOT WHITE.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

VII

A poll of students recently taken at Brooklyn College, in Greater New York, on a proposal to form a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, showed the following result: *No,* 1598; *Yes,* 1115.

In the *Christian Century* appears the following news note:

> Reference was recently made in The *Christian Century* to the action of a church in St. John, N. B., in defending the right of its minister to hold pacifist views. The session of the Glenmount United Church, Toronto, has also adopted resolutions testifying to its confidence in Rev. W. C. Almack, pastor of the church, and stating that while the congregation does not agree with his pacifist beliefs "they respect Mr. Almack's right to his personal convictions and recognize the right of freedom of conscience."

Ten pacifist organizations, headed by fourteen prominent religious leaders, sent a letter during the Christmas season to President Roosevelt, urging him to take the initiative to bring the neutral nations of the world together in an effort to mediate the wars now going on in Europe and the Orient. The letter also urged the United States "to indicate at the earliest opportunity the terms upon which it is prepared to coöperate in the establishment of peace."

The organizations supporting the appeal are the United Pacifist Committee, which formed the group to make the appeal; the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, the New York State Organization of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Peace Committee of the Religious Society of Friends, the New History Society; Pax, the organization of Roman Catholic conscientious objectors; the Bronx Free Fellowship, the Secretary for Peace League, and the American International Church of Labor Temple.

Among the leaders who signed the letter are the Reverend George A. Buttrick, of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church and president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, of the Riverside Church; the Reverend John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church, and the Reverend A. J. Muste, director of the Presbyterian Labor Temple and chairman of the United Pacifist Committee.

J. B. Priestley, the English novelist and playwright, has this to say:

> It is the falsest and most treacherous patriotism to trample on liberty, tolerance, fairmindedness; to neglect literature, music, art, drama, philosophy, the study and appreciation of nature; to close down the life of the mind and the spirit in order to win a victory that will then turn into a defeat. We can overthrow Naziism only by staying as much unlike it as possible.

Fellowship, monthly organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, publishes in its January issue the following news from New England:

> There is a refreshing eagerness on the part of New England students as they confront the fact of war in our world. Many have declared their pacifism; others are on the brink of a decision; still others are wanting some opportunity to clarify their thinking. In Harvard University, for example, there are about 45 pacifists meeting as a Harvard Pacifist Association. These men have already accepted the position and are now engaged in some phase of further study and action. They meet as teams once a week and as an association about once a month. One of the teams has decided to teach English to the German-speaking refugees in the community. Another team is responsible for publicity concerning the pacifist program.
>
> In Boston University there are eight peace teams which meet once a week. In the school of theology there are five such teams, in the college of liberal arts, two, and in the school of education, one. These groups have recently decided to be responsible for a dollar a week per group in order that a field secretary might be secured for some area outside of New England. They felt that if churches could send out missionaries, pacifists could send out peace secretaries.
>
> Peace teams have been started in various other schools, such as the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Tufts, Wheaton, and in church groups.

From Poland a letter is received by the Fellowship of Reconciliation:

> Can't understand why the war is waged. War won't settle any questions. Only after a bloody and horrible war must be the treaty, so why not start with a treaty and in this way avoid misery and unhappiness? War only breeds new reasons for war. As long as there is no love and justice there can be no peace. . . . I am glad that until now I hate no one and have convinced myself that even among the enemies which have been described as being so terrible I have met very nice and noble people.

Fellowship (January) publishes the following:

> From Earl M. Smith, an F.O.R. member living in Montevideo, Uruguay, comes this story showing the universality of man's conscience against war. He writes: "I thought you might be interested in an incident that was called vividly to my mind by the account in *Fellowship* concerning the departure of a British subject and an Austrian who were returning to take their stand as Christian pacifists. I had the sad pleasure of having to lunch with a French lad who was on his way to face he did not know what. He was afraid it was the firing squad. A medical student, he was eager to do work with the Red Cross or the Quakers preferably in the danger zone, but he was determined not to work in the army, even as a medical helper. God bless him and help him."

Walter Karig, Washington correspondent of the Newark *Evening News,* writes:

> Altogether, whether the world is to have peace or just another armistice in a 100 years' war, is not yet revealed to us. It should be heartening to the masses, who have to pay for wars, win or lose, with blood and taxes, that in this conflict there is an active search for the grounds upon which peace can be reconstructed before the battlefields are actually shell-pocked.

Correction

In our issue of January 1, 1940, in the article by Robert Whitaker, on page 143, Mr. Whitaker's statement should have read "I thought David Starr Jordan too hesitant when he said that once you were in a war there was no way *except* to go through with it." The word *except* was inadvertently omitted.

The Study Table

The Record of a Great Epoch

AMERICA IN MIDPASSAGE. *By Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard. 977 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $3.50.

In their book, the Beards have recounted the salient features of the last three presidential elections with swift, complete, and comprehending appraisal. They have traced the antics and horseplay, and analyzed the results. Public memory is brief and intervening events crowd our recollections of dupes and dummies which seemed of such startling significance at the moment of their disclosure. It will be good for us all to refresh our memory of the last few elections before we plunge into the next, with its full concomitant of issues, crusades and armageddons.

It will be more important still to let the Beards refresh our memories on the details of the Nye Congressional investigation into the causes and conditions of our entry into the last war before we take sides too strongly in the Battle of Neutralities now drawing to a head. Dr. Beard supplies much of the ammunition for the advocates of strict and self-contained neutrality —sometimes called "Isolationists." A recent article in the September *Harpers* from his pithy pen is an addenda to the two illuminating chapters on America's foreign policy in *Midpassage.* These chapters are eye-openers for innocents who had supposed American foreign policy to have been traditionally one of national isolation and international pacificism. Their generous review of the Nye Commission findings reads ominously like a review of current events.

Mr. and Mrs. Beard have had to bear up under two conflicting lines of criticism for this third volume of their critique of American civilization. On one side are many of their admirers who contend that the last decade of American history does not merit 950 pages of undigested comment which does not pretend to be a complete or documented history. Or, granting it may have been significant for all we can know at present to the contrary, we are, say they, too close to the trees to survey the woods. It is presumptuous to attempt to blaze a trail when we do not know where we are going or which, if any, is the way to get there!

The other school of critics reprove them for the many and glaring omissions! The quarrel is with their selective judgments. No mention of Harry Bridges and the Longshoreman's strike, in spite of a chapter on Labor; no reference to the work of John Haynes Holmes and the Civic Committee which cleaned out New York City politics once again. No mention of Child Welfare. Or Tom Mooney.

Well, be that as it may, which of us would care to undertake to repair their omissions or to do their omnibus job any better? The 950 pages need appall no one, for they are entirely readable and frequently skippable. Strictures on omissions will lessen, too, if the critics will take down volumes one and two, called together, *The Rise of American Civilization.* Many subjects which are too significant to brook omission were treated there and no repetition was needed.

For instance, Fundamentalism, Modernism, and the effort to reconcile science and religion had their day in court in the last chapter of volume II.

Then, too, some injustice had been done the Beards by incomplete indexing. For example, though the words Church and Religion are not found there, and few churchmen are listed (and they not always for contributions to religion!), still the progress of religious thought and action is repeatedly considered in the text itself. Church attendance is glanced at in the paragraph on philosophical trends, and the faith of men of science is considered in connection with the "Widening Outlook of Science," which gets an entire chapter to itself.

Humanism, ignored in the index, and, indeed, never referred to in the text as a religion, still is used repeatedly in descriptions of men and trends, and always as a term of praise and approbation. Not traditional Humanism, nor modern literary Humanism, but Humanism as appropriated by modern religious liberals, subtending Lincoln's democracy, Dewey's social philosophy, and Franklin Roosevelt's program.

Summing up the Beard's impression of the troubled Midpassage, we find them far from pessimistic. Though, in some respects it could be called "a period of confusion, defeatism, myths, and symbols," yet in others, notably letters and political economy, it showed virility, vitality, realism, and a drift toward genuine unification. In summing up their chapter on "Mainsprings and Ranges of Letters," they speak of "an energy and verve of style that betokened, on the whole, a vigorous mental and literary power." "Taken collectively, the letters of the period were marked by a penetration and a thrusting force that signified a growth rather than a diminution of insight and creative intelligence."

And they summarize their "Reconsideration of Democracy" by concluding that the last administration has "carried on the tradition of humanistic democracy which from colonial times had been a powerful dynamic in the whole movement of American civilization and culture." Roosevelt's return by overwhelming acclaim in 1936 "bore witness" say they, "to a profound moral and intellectual disturbance such as had characterized great epochs of the past."

In general this volume is more mellow and less biting than its predecessors. Even Hoover is given his due meed of praise. Roosevelt is praised repeatedly, for tolerance, for judgment, for patience, self-control, wisdom, and insight. Only his foreign policy draws caustic fire, and biting scorn is heaped upon what they consider his desire to cut a figure on the world stage, and his method of going about it. Kind words for the press, too, in their efforts "year by year, to attain a higher and higher degree of fair and balanced reporting," (in spite of numerous, frequent lapses).

One of the volume's greatest values is the generous accounts it gives of the administration's chief reforms, such as the widening of social services, federal projects, W.P.A. art and theater movements, public works, and the like. With the outbreak of the new World War this ample survey of the years intervening between the golden glow of Coolidge prosperity which followed the last war, and the rejection of Roosevelt's neutrality revision which helped to cause this one, takes on the color of "things necessary to be read." We have lived through it all, but how well did we appraise it in passing, and how well do we remember it now?

JULIA N. BUDLONG.

Correspondence

Clear Thinking on War

Editor of UNITY:

The need for clear thinking on war was demonstrated only too well by Curtis W. Reese in his article on that subject (UNITY, November 20). I hope he will bear with me if I express regret that he did not himself present a better example of that which he desiderates.

It is in the name of clear thinking that I ask why he did not tell what war is. To say, as he did, that "war is force plus violence," seems to me to "darken counsel by words without knowledge." "Force plus violence" no more indicates war than it indicates a football game or a prize fight.

What war actually is should be kept in mind in the discussion of war. Euphemisms are among the Devil's shrewdest devices. The word "war" itself is more or less euphemistic through its association with "Christian soldiers," brass bands and buttons, waving flags and strutting drum majors, and many other such distractions. Pacifists do well to avoid the word and to substitute the realistic term "collective homicide." For that is precisely what war is. So the great Russian sociologist, Novikov, defined it. An American pacifist, the late Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, whose name has been for many years honored by UNITY and its readers, defined war as "the deliberate, organized killing of one group of human beings by another group of human beings."

"Considered as process, war is undoubtedly an evil," says Dr. Reese. Sure thing! Killing fellow men is a dirty job, and being killed is no fun at all! But he adds that "many good things have resulted from war, including the American government, the emancipation of a race, the Soviet Republic, and other like developments." Now process is inseparable from its results, and if the results are good the process is redeemed thereby and should not be called evil. Thus surgery "when considered as process" is evil, that is, painful, weakening, disabling. But surgery that is wise and skillful, though it involve temporary suffering, has for its final result health, strength, longer life. Accordingly no one thinks of calling surgery, or surgery "as process" or "as such," evil. Surgery is good, a blessing to mankind.

Surgery, of course, should not be employed if a less taxing treatment can save the patient. It is a last resort. Likewise war—assuming for the moment that it may have good results—can be justified only when less costly methods are not available, and that is, in my humble opinion, *never*. There always was and always will be a better way, a more reasonable procedure, than wholesale killing.

I deny, however, that "many good things have resulted from war." Such, to be sure, is the tradition in which we have all been indoctrinated. But I dare assert that it is palpable superstition, as gross and absurd as belief in witchcraft and immensely more harmful. In the vast complex of war, certain good things may appear, but on balance the losses enormously exceed the gains, although no one can measure losses of human life, for no one can know what potential ability, perhaps genius, which might have blessed the world, was snuffed out when the flower of a nation's youth perished.

Generally speaking, a living human being is preferable to a corpse. I admit individual exceptions, but not many. On that postulate the pacifist rests his case. It is by association with our kind—with the living, not with corpses—that human life is expanded and enriched. Collective homicide is the extreme flouting of this law. It is a disease of society, an impoverishment of life. Were it universal, the extinction of the human race would speedily ensue. Instinct keeps the lower animals from like suicidal folly.

Such virtue as the American government possesses was not due to the Revolutionary War, but to the wisdom of the statesmen who framed our Constitution several years after that war ended. The war itself was a blunder and disaster, a hindrance to the present day to that federation of the world which is long overdue. The political tie to the mother country should not have been sundered.

To credit our Civil War with the emancipation of the Negroes is a mistake, the fact being that that war postponed their emancipation—except on paper—indefinitely, for it is not yet achieved.

Whether the Soviet Republic is a "good thing" or not may be questioned just now, if not several weeks ago when Dr. Reese wrote. Was it a result of the World War in which the Russian armies had been defeated? Does a good result sometimes follow defeat and sometimes follow victory, collective homicide itself being the valuable ingredient?

"War is preferable to slavery." Is it? Regardless of the military issue? Does the more righteous side always win? Which took the wiser course, the Czechs or the Poles? "Give me liberty, or give me death," said Patrick Henry, not at all desiring death. "While there's life there's hope"—of liberty and every other good. But liberty avails naught to corpses.

War is not an alternative to slavery but rather a form of slavery. Conscription, without which no government can today carry on a war, is the basest slavery. "Conscription," said the late Charles F. Dole, "leaves out of sight the man's mind, his faculty of choice, his honor, his conscience and his moral judgment. For the purpose of war he is an animal, forced as by the whip to do as he is bidden. The conscripted soldier has no will of his own, even in view of the most ghastly or dastardly deeds. He has no business with opinions. He must not so much as breathe an opinion contrary to the war to his closest comrade. Could a human being ever be put into a more ignominious situation?"

As to Dr. Reese's desire to help the "democratic" belligerents to defeat the "totalitarian," even while we maintain "official neutrality," it should be said that the true interest of Americans and all other peoples calls for "peace without victory." When at war every government is totalitarian. "Constitutionally guaranteed liberties" are then not worth a tinker's dam nor anybody's damn—of another spelling. Our government should urge that the killing and destruction stop at once and be followed by an international conference for disarmament and an international federal government. In other words, let human beings be human beings. Collective homicide sinks man below the brutes. What Dr. L. P. Jacks said in 1917 is ápropos: "There is nothing in the life of the lowest of the beasts which can be compared for utter senselessness with the mutual rending to pieces of the nations."

Finally, consider this: "When it is granted that war as such is a plague, it still does no more good to rail against it than it does to rail against an epidemic of influenza." Nonsense! The epidemic is due to germs and they are not affected by human speech. But war is made and carried on by human beings and they are more or less responsive to railing, to argument, to persuasion, to satire and ridicule. That is why I am trying to deal faithfully with Dr. Reese, surprised and grieved that he does not know better by this time than to justify collective homicide. And in UNITY! Jenkin Lloyd Jones would turn in his grave if he knew.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 150)

Progress in dealing with the problem would therefore seem clearly to lie somewhere along the line of public control. The task would seem to be the perfection of that official mechanism which shall most effectually serve the common will in insuring this control.

Nevertheless, there is widespread speculative exploitation of the liquor business. Liquor is being forced upon the attention of the young and those of all ages, everywhere. Especially active is this aggressive salesmanship along our numerous major highways, where the notorious incompetence of drinking drivers is being accentuated by almost every device of the advertiser. Bootlegging continues. A complicated license system and numerous influences boosting the price of liquor tend to invite evasions of the law in pursuit of large profits.

How more adequately to cope with these evils is the concern of all good citizens, whatever may be differences of opinion among such citizens on questions of prohibition, total abstinence and other incidents of liquor usage.

So long as the vending of liquor is open to unrestrained commercial exploitation under any system of control, control must remain difficult. Systems have been developed which effectually control the traffic, and at the same time insure to all adult citizens access to alcoholic liquors of all kinds at reasonable convenience. It has been fully demonstrated that only unflagging vigilance on the part of the citizenry can hold the traffic in sufficient restraint to safeguard in any degree the good repute and fair name of the community.

—*New Jersey Committee for the Study of Liquor Control Methods.*